

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 4, 6, and 7 have been amended. New claim 9 has been added. Claims 1-7 and 9 are currently pending in the application.

Claims 1-7 and 9 are currently pending in the application. On page 5 of the Office Action, claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,442,620 (Thatte) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0023180 (Klimczak).

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleged that Applicants attacked the "references individually without taking into consideration based on the teaching of combinations of references as show in the above." See Office Action, page 4 [sic].

Applicants respectfully submit that Applicants' arguments in the previous Office Action supported the fact that Klimczak does not cure the deficiencies of Thatte. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art could not combine the references in such a way as to render the present invention obvious. Hence, the references were not attacked individually. Rather the combination of references was addressed.

On page 4 of the current Office Action, the Examiner's position appears to be that Klimczak's object ID 320 stored in table 312 corresponds to the present invention's message. Applicants respectfully submit that Klimczak's object ID is clearly not a message. Rather, in contrast to the present invention, Klimczak's object ID is simply an identifier that identifies an object, which is not tantamount to or related to a message.

Moreover, as recited in currently amended claim 1, in the present invention, a message includes a message type and a message body. For example, as is clearly indicated in FIG. 4 of the present invention, the message 400 includes the message type 401 and the message body 402. See specification of the present invention, page 14, lines 9-10.

Applicants respectfully submit that assuming *arguendo* that Klimczak's tables 4 and 5 disclose the "action" identified in the present invention, Klimczak does not disclose a message, much less a message including a message type and a message body. An object ID does not include a message type and a message body, as an object ID is simply an identifier for an object.

Therefore, claims 1, 4, 6, and 7 are patentable over the references, as neither Thatte nor Klimczak, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the above-identified feature of the present invention.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 9 is patentable over the references, as the references fail to disclose or suggest, "a message receiving part for allowing an object to monitor and capture a message transmitted on a network, said message including data required for an action or parameters and being composed of a message type and a message body wherein said message type includes a hierarchial structure of a class derivation original message type and a class derivation message type," as recited in claim 9.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 2/8/07

By: 

Reginald D. Lucas  
Registration No. 46,883

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501